



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/627,896

07/25/2003

Hassan Mahini

2002-014

4007

54472 7590 01/30/2008
COATS & BENNETT/SONY ERICSSON
1400 CRESCENT GREEN
SUITE 300
CARY, NC 27511

EXAMINER

BALAOING, ARIEL A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2617

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/30/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/627,896

Applicant(s)

MAHINI, HASSAN

Examiner

Ariel Balaoing

Art Unit

2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 January 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-10,13-19 and 22-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 29-34 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-10,13-19 and 22-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments, see page 2 of the remarks, filed 01/15/2007, with respect to the rejection(s) of the claims have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of HOSACK et al (US 5,418,528).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
4. Claims 1, 4-7, 10, 13-16, 19, 22-25, and 28 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over KRAFT (6,381,474 B1) in view of HOSACK et al (US 5,418,528).

Regarding claim 1, KRAFT discloses a method accessing functions in a mobile communication device (abstract) comprising: dynamically updating an event list [redo & undo list] responsive to designated events by adding events to said event list when a new event occurs and automatically deleting an event from said event list when a user responds to the event (abstract; col. 1, line 48-col 2, line 50; col. 3, line 3-col. 4, line 16; col. 4, line 50-col. 5, line 8; col. 6, line 14-63; col. 7, line 25-47; events are added to the list according to various occurrences. Automatic deletion is provided when a user

responds to an item with multiple occurrences, or when a user responds to a missed event such as a missed call), or if the event is the last event (oldest event on list) associated with a category of similar events on said event list (col. 5, line 65-col. 6, line 3; col. 6, line 57-63); displaying said event list to a user on a display (Figure 3; abstract); associating a menu item in a hierarchical menu with each event in said event list (abstract; col. 1, line 48-col 2, line 50; col. 3, line 3-col. 4, line 16; col. 4, line 50-col. 5, line 8; col. 6, line 14-63; col. 7, line 25-47; selection of items in the event list can launch various applications which reside in different sub-menus); and invoking the associated menu item in said hierarchical menu responsive to selection of an event from said event list by said user (abstract; col. 1, line 48-col 2, line 50; col. 3, line 3-col. 4, line 16; col. 4, line 50-col. 5, line 8; col. 6, line 14-63; col. 7, line 25-47). However, KRAFT does not expressly disclose wherein automatically deleting events occurs only if both criteria met (see page 2 of the remarks). In a similar field of the endeavor, HOSACK discloses automatically deleting an event (message) from an event list when a user responds to an event (read messages), and if the event is the last event (oldest message) associated with a category (read messages that are not anchored) of similar events on said event list (**345, 355, 365**; col. 4, line 40-67). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify KRAFT to include the teachings of HOSACK, since HOSACK states that such a modification would allow a system to selectively delete events in order to free up storage space (see col. 1, line 28-38).

Regarding claim 4, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. KRAFT further discloses wherein said event list is displayed responsive to entry of a shortcut command by said user (abstract; Figure 3; col. 3, line 57-col. 4, line 8; col. 4, line 50-57; col. 7, line 44-51).

Regarding claim 5, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. KRAFT further discloses further comprising sorting said event list before said event list is displayed (col. 2, line 39-58; col. 7, line 52-64).

Regarding claim 6, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. KRAFT further discloses wherein said event list is sorted in time order (col. 2, line 39-58; col. 7, line 52-64).

Regarding claim 7, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. KRAFT further discloses wherein said event list is sorted based on priorities assigned to said events on said event list (col. 2, line 39-58; col. 7, line 52-64).

Regarding claim 10, KRAFT discloses a mobile communication device (abstract) comprising: a display for displaying menu items in a hierarchical menu for selection by a user (abstract; Figure 3; col. 3, line 57-col. 4, line 8; col. 4, line 50-57; col. 7, line 44-51); a memory for storing an event list (col. 1, line 52-col. 2, line 50); a processor configured to: dynamically update said event list responsive to designated events by adding events to said event list when a new designated event occurs and automatically deleting an event from said event list when a user responds to the event (abstract; col. 1, line 48-col

2, line 50; col. 3, line 3-col. 4, line 16; col. 4, line 50-col. 5, line 8; col. 6, line 14-63; col. 7, line 25-47; events are added to the list according to various occurrences. Automatic deletion is provided when a user responds to an item with multiple occurrences, or when a user responds to a missed event such as a missed call), or if the event is the last event (oldest event on list) associated with a category of similar events on said event list (col. 5, line 65-col. 6, line 3; col. 6, line 57-63); display said event list on a display for viewing by a user (Figure 3; abstract); associate a menu item in a hierarchical menu with each event in said event list (abstract; col. 1, line 48-col. 2, line 50; col. 3, line 3-col. 4, line 16; col. 4, line 50-col. 5, line 8; col. 6, line 14-63; col. 7, line 25-47); and invoke the associated menu item in said hierarchical menu responsive to selection by said user of an event from said event list (abstract; col. 1, line 48-col. 2, line 50; col. 3, line 3-col. 4, line 16; col. 4, line 50-col. 5, line 8; col. 6, line 14-63; col. 7, line 25-47). However, KRAFT does not expressly disclose wherein automatically deleting events occurs only if both criteria met (see page 2 of the remarks). In a similar field of the endeavor, HOSACK discloses automatically deleting an event (message) from an event list when a user responds to an event (read messages), and if the event is the last event (oldest message) associated with a category (read messages that are not anchored) of similar events on said event list (**345, 355, 365**; col. 4, line 40-67).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify KRAFT to include the teachings of HOSACK, since HOSACK states that such a modification would allow a system to selectively delete events in order to free up storage space (see col. 1, line 28-38).

Regarding claim 13, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. KRAFT further discloses wherein the processor displays said event list responsive to entry of a shortcut command by said user (abstract; Figure 3; col. 3, line 57-col. 4, line 8; col. 4, line 50-57; col. 7, line 44-51).

Regarding claim 14, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. KRAFT further discloses wherein the processor sorts said event list before said event list is displayed (col. 2, line 39-58; col. 7, line 52-64).

Regarding claim 15, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. KRAFT further discloses wherein the processor sorts said event list in time order (col. 2, line 39-58; col. 7, line 52-64).

Regarding claim 16, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. KRAFT further discloses wherein the processor sorts said event list based on priorities assigned to said events on said event list (col. 2, line 39-58; col. 7, line 52-64).

Regarding claim 19, KRAFT discloses a circuit for controlling a user interface including a display (abstract), said circuit comprising a processor programmed to: generate and dynamically update said event list responsive to designated events by adding events to said event list when a new designated event occurs and automatically deleting an event from said event list when a user responds to the event (abstract; col. 1, line 48-col. 2, line 50; col. 3, line 3-col. 4, line 16; col. 4, line 50-col. 5, line 8; col. 6, line 14-63; col. 7, line 25-47; events are added to the list according to various

occurrences. Automatic deletion is provided when a user responds to an item with multiple occurrences, or when a user responds to a missed event such as a missed call), or if the event is the last event (oldest event on list) associated with a category of similar events on said event list (col. 5, line 65-col. 6, line 3; col. 6, line 57-63); display said event list on a display for viewing by a user (Figure 3; abstract); associate a menu item in a hierarchical menu with each event in said event list (abstract; col. 1, line 48-col. 2, line 50; col. 3, line 3-col. 4, line 16; col. 4, line 50-col. 5, line 8; col. 6, line 14-63; col. 7, line 25-47); and invoke the associated menu item in said hierarchical menu responsive to selection by said user of an event from said event list (abstract; col. 1, line 48-col. 2, line 50; col. 3, line 3-col. 4, line 16; col. 4, line 50-col. 5, line 8; col. 6, line 14-63; col. 7, line 25-47). However, KRAFT does not expressly disclose wherein automatically deleting events occurs only if both criteria met (see page 2 of the remarks). In a similar field of the endeavor, HOSACK discloses automatically deleting an event (message) from an event list when a user responds to an event (read messages), and if the event is the last event (oldest message) associated with a category (read messages that are not anchored) of similar events on said event list (345, 355, 365; col. 4, line 40-67). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify KRAFT to include the teachings of HOSACK, since HOSACK states that such a modification would allow a system to selectively delete events in order to free up storage space (see col. 1, line 28-38).

Regarding claim 22, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. KRAFT further discloses wherein the processor displays said event list responsive to entry of a shortcut command by said user (abstract; Figure 3; col. 3, line 57-col. 4, line 8; col. 4, line 50-57; col. 7, line 44-51).

Regarding claim 23, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. KRAFT further discloses wherein the processor sorts said event list before said event list is displayed (col. 2, line 39-58; col. 7, line 52-64).

Regarding claim 24, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. KRAFT further discloses wherein the processor sorts said event list in time order (col. 2, line 39-58; col. 7, line 52-64).

Regarding claim 25, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. KRAFT further discloses wherein the processor sorts said event list based on priorities assigned to said events on said event list (col. 2, line 39-58; col. 7, line 52-64).

Regarding claim 28, KRAFT discloses a computer readable medium having logic stored thereon, the logic configured to control a user interface in a mobile communication device, and to control said mobile communication device (abstract), said program including instructions to cause said mobile communication device to: add events to a dynamically updated event list responsive to designated events (abstract; col. 1, line 48-col. 2, line 50; col. 3, line 3-col. 4, line 16; col. 4, line 50-col. 5, line 8; col. 6, line 14-63; col. 7, line 25-47); automatically delete an event from said event list when

the user responds to the event on said event list (abstract; col. 1, line 48-col 2, line 50; col. 3, line 3-col. 4, line 16; col. 4, line 50-col. 5, line 8; col. 6, line 14-63; col. 7, line 25-47), or if the event is the last event (oldest event on list) associated with a category of similar events on said event list (col. 5, line 65-col. 6, line 3; col. 6, line 57-63); display said event list on a display for viewing by a user (Figure 3; abstract); associate a menu item in a hierarchical menu with each event in said event list (abstract; col. 1, line 48-col 2, line 50; col. 3, line 3-col. 4, line 16; col. 4, line 50-col. 5, line 8; col. 6, line 14-63; col. 7, line 25-47); and invoke the associated menu item in said hierarchical menu responsive to selection by said user of an event from said event list (abstract; col. 1, line 48-col 2, line 50; col. 3, line 3-col. 4, line 16; col. 4, line 50-col. 5, line 8; col. 6, line 14-63; col. 7, line 25-47). However, KRAFT does not expressly disclose wherein automatically deleting events occurs only if both criteria met (see page 2 of the remarks). In a similar field of the endeavor, HOSACK discloses automatically deleting an event (message) from an event list when a user responds to an event (read messages), and if the event is the last event (oldest message) associated with a category (read messages that are not anchored) of similar events on said event list (345, 355, 365; col. 4, line 40-67). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify KRAFT to include the teachings of HOSACK, since HOSACK states that such a modification would allow a system to selectively delete events in order to free up storage space (see col. 1, line 28-38).

5. Claims 8, 9, 17, 18, 26, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over KRAFT (6,381,474 B1) in view of HOSACK et al (US 5,418,528) and in further view of ROTH (US 6,266,060 B1).

Regarding claim 8, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependant upon. Although KRAFT discloses using priority sorting (col. 2, line 39-58; col. 7, line 52-64), the combination of KRAFT and HOSACK does not expressly disclose wherein said priorities are assigned to said events on said event list by the user. ROTH discloses wherein said priorities are assigned to said events on said event list by the user (column 13:line 21-column 14:line 33). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of KRAFT and HOSACK to include the menu sorting abilities described in ROTH as both disclose a way to prioritize menu rankings. As stated by ROTH, *it should be understood that the present invention can be used to arrange any menu of user-selectable items regardless of the medium that is used to present the menu* (column 5:lines 30-38, column 5:lines 46-59, column 6:lines 31-42). This is beneficial in that it allows for various sorting techniques in any menu environment of user-selectable items.

Regarding claim 9, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependant upon. The combination of KRAFT, HOSACKROTH further discloses wherein said event list is sorted based on usage statistics associated with said events on said event list (ROTH - column 13:line 21-column 14:line 33).

Regarding claim 17 and 26, see the rejections of the parent claims concerning the subject matter these claims are dependant upon. Although KRAFT discloses using priority sorting (col. 2, line 39-58; col. 7, line 52-64), the combination of KRAFT and HOSACK does not expressly disclose wherein said priorities are assigned to said events on said event list by the user. ROTH discloses wherein said priorities are assigned to said events on said event list by a user (column 13:line 21-column 14:line 33). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of KRAFT and HOSACK to include the menu sorting abilities described in ROTH as both disclose a way to prioritize menu rankings. As stated by ROTH, *it should be understood that the present invention can be used to arrange any menu of user-selectable items regardless of the medium that is used to present the menu* (column 5:lines 30-38, column 5:lines 46-59, column 6:lines 31-42). This is beneficial in that it allows for various sorting techniques in any menu environment of user-selectable items.

Regarding claim 18 and 27, see the rejections of the parent claims concerning the subject matter these claims are dependant upon. The combination of KRAFT, HOSACK, and ROTH further discloses wherein the processor sorts said event list based on usage statistics associated with said events on said event list (ROTH - column 13:line 21-column 14:line 33).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ariel Balaoing whose telephone number is (571) 272-

Application/Control Number:
10/627,896
Art Unit: 2617

Page 12

7317. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Trost can be reached on (571) 272-7872. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ariel Balaoing – Art Unit 2617

AB



WILLIAM TROST
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600